



## Meeting Minutes

### October 22, 2014

#### Members Present

Chair Bill McConnell, Mr. Scott Feeny, Mr. David Galvin, Mr. Jeffrey Hudnall, Ms. Allison Leeuw, Dr. Stacy Townsley, Mr. Andrew VanZee

#### Members absent

None.

#### Staff present

Ms. Jackie Dowd and Mr. Shane Hatchett

#### I. Call to Order

Chair McConnell called the meeting to order at 10:00AM.

#### II. Chair's Welcome and Report

Chair McConnell welcomed members, representatives, and guests. Mr. Hatchett called roll and a quorum was established. Minutes for September 10, 2014 meeting were presented to members. Mr. VanZee motioned to approve the Minutes from the September 10, 2014 meeting. Mr. Galvin seconded and members unanimously approved the minutes.

#### III. Public Comment

Chair McConnell indicated there were no sign-ups for public comment, but that there would be an opportunity, time permitting, at the end of the meeting for comments.

#### IV. Introduction of INK Executive Director and Staff Transitions

Chair McConnell welcomed Jeffrey Hudnall as the new Executive Director of INK. Jackie Dowd introduced Mr. Hudnall, and gave some background information including his work in higher education, his recent meetings with stakeholders, and his process of becoming acquainted with issues facing INK. Mr. Hudnall introduced himself to members of the committee, and described his first few weeks in transitioning in his new position.

#### V. Data Governance Discussion

Mr. Hatchett started the discussion by addressing how to handle requests for single sector data versus public sector. He said that single sector data requests will go to specific agencies, which house the data. Mr. VanZee suggested that the workflow be updated to reflect that single-sector requests would not be outright denied, but referred to the appropriate agency.

Chair McConnell responded to a question about INK knowing what questions have been asked and if INK is going to keep records of inquiries. He said that some requests would be referred back to the single agency wherein the requested data originated.

Dr. Townsley asked if the CHE ROI report would meet threshold to bring it to the governance committee for review and at what point requests are analyzed. Mr. Hatchett mentioned that it is up to the board. He said INK board members must decide what requests go to partner agencies.

Ms. Leeuw recommended that INK needs to provide a simplified and expedited process so that research can be offered by INK in a faster use of data/research. She would like to see the data workflow document in a simplified format. Mr. Hatchett noted that the process is complex to account for various levels of review and potential outcomes; the process documentation can be distilled at a later date, but this version must be complex so that all partner agencies understand how requests will be handled.

Mr. VanZee addressed the question on whether every request would need to go through approval. He said he thought there would be parameters that would preapprove some requests and could set a precedent. Mr. Hatchett said that staff cannot determine this yet because there has not been a precedence set. Mr. VanZee suggested that after initial approvals are made, staff could use those to recommend what the board approves. Mr. Hatchett recommended that staff can show the board a list of pre-approved requests, and any request that is not on the list would go through approval by the governance committee.

Ms. Leeuw mentioned that there are some reports that are common enough to justify INK keeping regular reports. She said CHE and DWD have some reports but the DOE does not really have similar reports. Mr. Galvin said that DOE does have quarterly reports, but said that lack of staff funding limits the amount of reports possible. Ms. Leeuw mentioned that the MOU and data request forms would clarify and communicate what INK can provide to requesters. She suggested the committee should consult agency counsel to simplify the process.

Dr. Townsley asked whether some focus could be put on internal requests. Chair McConnell responded that only cross-agency data comes through INK. Internal and external requests which seek to combine multiple agencies' data start here.

The question was raised about whether INK can release the questions that are being asked to the public. Mr. Feeny said the committee should address not only the research results but also the way the information is presented. Mr. VanZee added that INK needs to disclose what is legally required, specifically, public records.

A question was raised about how the handling of internal vs. external data requests. Chair McConnell mentioned that there might be a difference in confidentiality when comparing internal to external requests. Dr. Townsley felt that requests should be treated the same. Ms. Dowd said that everyone is covered under FERPA, so there is a common data protection concern and is clear on what is to be shared. Mr. Hudnall mentioned that he would continue to research the issues surrounding data requests and would research other states for best practices in this area.

## **VI. Interagency Memorandum of Understanding**

Mr. Hatchett provided some context of the current state of the MOU. Mr. Hatchett shared the IWIS MOU with the committee members during the August meeting. That MOU is valid until April 2015. Mr. VanZee felt it was best to not wait until May 2015 for a new MOU. Ms. Leeuw



said it might affect Indiana Business Research Center (IBRC) and that they are crucial to data questions for the data they collect. Mr. Hatchett noted that the Committee can always enter into a secondary MOU directly with IBRC for data sharing or to conduct analyses on behalf of the Committee. Chair McConnell mentioned that each agency's counsel will have to review this document before it can be executed. Then Kevin McDowell at the Attorney General's office will look at it.

Chair McConnell suggested INK take an approach with data requests that puts the responsibility on the Partner Agency for final disclosure review deadlines. He mentioned that if the Partner Agency doesn't get back to INK within a 30 day window, the data would be published. This would put the onus on the agency to respond within the specific time frame or the data could be published.

A target date of November 14, 2014 to get comments to Mr. Hatchett was suggested. All agency attorneys will review the comments. Feedback will then be forwarded to the Attorney General's office so it can be reviewed prior to the next meeting.

## **VII. Research Agenda Framework**

Chair McConnell lead discussion and asked the committee what they think the term "framework" means to them. Mr. VanZee said he thinks a framework is a consolidation of certain topics or areas of focus that ensures a system is set up to address those areas. Mr. Hatchett mentioned that INK is required to set the research agenda by the Legislature. Dr. Townsley said the purpose of the longitudinal data system is to get a holistic view of data. Chair McConnell said we could take the approach of building the aggregate database for people to use or we could build the database based on the demands of the public, but we should try to drive some useful purpose to this process. Ms. Dowd mentioned that across agencies the first priority is making sure there is transparency of information.

There was some discussion on what the data could/should be used for. Mr. Feeny mentioned that the results should address more than simple wage data connected to certain industries or colleges and universities. He mentioned the importance of looking at that data in a broader scope.

The committee recommended that Mr. Hudnall and Mr. Hatchett work on a research framework for the next meeting. Mr. Hudnall will put together a list of research categories for the governance committee to consider for the INK research framework moving forward.

## **VIII. Staff Updates**

Ms. Dowd mentioned that INK is working with IOT since netlogx, LLC was chosen as the vendor. There were no protests in the 5-day window, so we are now working through the contract with them and moving forward.

Mr. Hudnall mentioned that he had good meetings with governance committee members and other stakeholders. Everyone's comments were generally positive about the direction of INK. All of the members seemed to be on the same page with comments and concerns.



Mr. Hatchett provided an update on the USDOE site visit for the SLDS grant. He mentioned they were pleased that despite pauses caused by shifts in oversight from the agencies to the Career Council and now INK, Indiana's SLDS work continues and is heading in the right direction. He mentioned the biggest challenges are sustainability and looming deadlines in 2015.

**IX. Adjourn**

Chair McConnell reminded members of the next meeting on December 1, 2014 at 10:00AM.

Dr. Townsley motioned to adjourn, Ms. Leeuw seconded. The meeting adjourned at 11:45AM.